

Equivalence of NMR and SERF gyroscopes

Haifeng Dong^{1, a)} and Haichao Huang¹

School of Instrumentation Science and Opto-Electronics Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China.

(Dated: 17 November 2016)

There are two kinds of atomic vapor cell gyroscopes, one is nuclear-magnetic-resonance (NMR) gyroscope and the other is spin-exchange-relaxation-free (SERF) gyroscope. We demonstrate that there is a common model for these two kinds of gyroscope. The output signals of NMR and SERF gyroscopes are compared directly, which provides an important guidance for the scheme choosing and optimization of atomic gyroscope. Although this expose of the equivalence cannot solve the current problems of atomic gyroscopes, such as the narrow response bandwidth of SERF gyroscope and the drift due to the different Fermi-contact interaction coefficient in NMR gyroscope, it provides a simple understanding of atomic gyroscopes and may inspire new schemes combining advantages of both NMR and SERF gyroscopes.

PACS numbers: 85.70.Sq, 78.20.Ls, 33.57.+c

Keywords: atomic gyroscope; nuclear magnetic resonance; spin exchange relaxation free; model

Gyroscopes are used not only for practical applications such as navigation and positioning but also for physical theorem verification, such as test of general relativity etc.^{1,2}. Due to their insensitivity to magnetic fields, atomic spin gyroscopes are essentially important scientific instruments for many fundamental physics, such as searches for electron-dipole-moment (EDM) and axion-like particles³, as well as test of charge-parity-time (CPT) and Lorentz symmetry⁴. NMR gyroscope used in search for axion-like particles has ever improved the laboratory bound by two orders of magnitude³, while SERF gyroscope used in the CPT and Lorentz symmetry experiments improved previous limits by two to four orders of magnitude⁵. Here we consider two actively-developed nuclear-spin gyroscope schemes: one based on NMR detection of two nuclear spin species, and the other works under SERF regime, which uses only a single nuclear spin species.⁶

In a typical NMR gyroscope configuration, two nuclear spin species are used to suppress magnetic field noise. The common explanation is that by solving the equations of $\omega_1 = \gamma_1 B + \Omega$ and $\omega_2 = \gamma_2 B + \Omega$, one can eliminate the magnetic field and get the rotation rate by $\Omega = (\gamma_2 \omega_1 - \gamma_1 \omega_2) / (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)$ ^{7,8}. In practice, one species is typically used to stabilize the magnetic field while the rotation rate is measured through the other⁹. In recent experiments, alkali vapor is used to pump the noble gases through spin exchange and to probe the Larmor precession of the noble gases polarization^{7,10,11}. The Fermi-contact interaction between alkali atoms and noble gas enhance the signal, while it also leads to the bias drift because of the big difference of the Fermi-contact interaction enhancement factor for two kinds of nuclear species. A basic design principle is to let the alkali polarization direction perpendicular to the main field (usually B_y). This can be achieved by pulse pumping and detection¹²,

or synchronous spin-exchange optical pumping¹³. The state-of-the-art scheme eliminates the back-polarization during the in-the-dark period using π pulse to average Rb polarization.¹⁴

For the comagnetometer SERF gyroscope, only one species of nuclear spin is used. It is also pumped by spin-exchange with alkali atoms. Here besides the pumping effect, the alkali spins also behave as one of the noble gas in NMR gyroscope. Unlike the NMR scheme, the output of this scheme is the steady-state of the alkali polarization projection in the probe direction, not a Larmor precession rate of the noble gases, which limits its response bandwidth to about $1/T_{2a}$, where T_{2a} is mainly decided by the alkali spin-destruction relaxation under the SERF regime¹⁵⁻¹⁷.

Although these two schemes seem to be different at the first glance, they have commonality in essence. They consist of at least two coupled spin-species, one of which cancels the field fluctuation, while the other is used to read-out the rotation rate. Both of them have a compensation equation with the same form, and their scale factors are enhanced by the ratio of the gyromagnetic ratios of two coupled spin-species.

Here we demonstrate these similarities and give a direct comparison between two schemes.

Fig. 1 is the basic measurement scheme for NMR gyroscope. There are two nuclear spins (No.1 and No.2) with different gyromagnetic ratios. Suppose that the bias field B_y is much larger than the nuclear spin polarization field and ignoring the alkali magnetization and the quadrupole effect of certain nuclear species, such as ¹²⁹Xe, the equivalent total fields experienced by spin one and spin two are as below^{7,8},

$$B_1 = \frac{\omega_1}{\gamma_1} = B_y + \frac{\Omega_y}{\gamma_1}, \quad (1a)$$

$$B_2 = \frac{\omega_2}{\gamma_2} = B_y + \frac{\Omega_y}{\gamma_2}. \quad (1b)$$

^{a)}Electronic mail: hfdong@buaa.edu.cn




FIG. 1. The basic measurement scheme for NMR gyroscope. PBS: polarizing beam splitter, PD: photodetector, LIA: Lock-in Amplifier

where w_1 and w_2 are the Larmor frequencies of spin one and spin two, respectively, γ_1 and γ_2 are the gyromagnetic ratios of spin one and spin two, respectively, and Ω_y

is the frame rotation rate around y-axis. As the Larmor precession w_1 is measured and servoed to the field coil, B_1 is stabilized. In this way, there appears a compensation equation as below,

$$B_y = B_1 - \Omega_y/\gamma_1. \quad (2)$$

In Fig.1, signal before Lock-in amplifier two (LIA2), i.e. output of PBS balanced polarimetry is

$$S_b = 2I_0\theta = I_0nlcr_e f D(v)P_x. \quad (3)$$

where I_0 is the amplitude of probe beam, n is the alkali density, l is the optical path length, c is the light speed, r_e is the classical radius of the electron, f is the oscillator strength, $D(v) = \frac{v-v_0}{(v-v_0)^2 + (\Delta v/2)^2}$, P_x is the steady-state of the alkali spin polarization projection in the probe direction as the Larmor precession of nuclear polarization is much longer than the transverse relaxation time of alkali spins polarization, i.e. the magnetic field changes slowly,

$$P_x = P_0 \frac{\frac{1}{T_{2a}\gamma_a} B_{xz} \sin(w_2 t + \psi) + B_{xz} \cos(w_2 t + \psi) B_y}{[B_{xz} \sin(w_2 t + \psi)]^2 + [B_{xz} \cos(w_2 t + \psi)]^2 + B_y^2 + \left(\frac{1}{T_{2a}\gamma_a}\right)^2} \approx P_0 \frac{B_{xz}}{B_y} \cos(w_2 t + \psi). \quad (4)$$

where T_{2a} is the transverse relaxation time of alkali spin polarization, B_{xz} is the projection of nuclear magnetization sensed by alkali atoms in xz plane, w_2 is the Larmor precession frequency of No.2 nuclear polarization, $w_2 t + \psi$ is the angle between B_{xz} and x axis, ψ is initial phase of the nuclear Larmor precession, i.e. the phase difference between modulated current and the nuclear Larmor precession. After Lock-in amplifier, the quadrature output of LIA2 is as below,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{NMR} &= I_0nlcr_e f D(v) P_0 \frac{B_{xz}}{B_y} \sin(\psi) \\ &\approx I_0nlcr_e f D(v) P_0 \frac{B_{xz}}{B_y} \psi \\ &= I_0nlcr_e f D(v) P_0 \frac{B_{xz}}{B_y} T_{2n2} \Delta w \\ &= I_0nlcr_e f D(v) P_0 \frac{B_{xz}}{B_y} T_{2n2} [w_2^m - (B_y \gamma_{n2} + \Omega_y)]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where Δw is the detune of the modulated field. Insert the equation (2) into the equation (5), set $w_2^m = B_1 \gamma_{n2}$, and use the optimization of modulated field amplitude $B_m = \frac{1}{\gamma_{n2} \sqrt{T_{1n2} T_{2n2}}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{NMR} &= I_0nlcr_e f D(v) P_0 \frac{B_{xz}}{B_y} \left[T_{2n2} \left(\frac{\gamma_{n2}}{\gamma_{n1}} - 1 \right) \Omega_y \right] \\ &\approx I_0nlcr_e f D(v) P_0 \frac{B_n}{B_y} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{T_{2n2}}{T_{1n2}}} T_{2n2} \left(\frac{\gamma_{n2}}{\gamma_{n1}} - 1 \right) \Omega_y \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{B_n}{B_y} \sqrt{\frac{T_{2n2}}{T_{1n2}}} \cdot H \cdot T_{2n2} \left(\frac{\gamma_{n2}}{\gamma_{n1}} - 1 \right) \Omega_y \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The approximations in the above deductions are under the assumption that the modulated frequency is close to the Larmor precession frequency of nuclear polarization so that ψ is close to zero and $B_{xy} = B_x$.

From equation (6), we can see that there is no bias drift related to B_y in the output signal, while variation of B_y do lead to the scale factor instability. And Ω_y is enhanced by a factor of $\frac{\gamma_{n2}}{\gamma_{n1}} - 1$.

Fig. 2 is the basic measurement scheme for comagnetometer SERF gyroscope, which comprises one alkali and one noble gas, the pumping is along z direction and B_x , B_y are compensated to zero using magnetic shield and coils (not shown in the figure). In this way the polarization of alkali can be regarded as in z direction. Thus the spin-exchange pumping direction of the noble gas is also




FIG. 2. The basic measurement scheme for SERF gyroscope. The polarization and magnetization of alkali and noble nuclear, as well as the compensation field in z direction are shown in the inset cross-section figure. PBS: polarizing beam splitter, PD: photodetector

in z direction and the steady-state solution of the noble gas dynamics can be deduced from Bloch equations¹⁸,

$$P_{ny} = \frac{B_x B_{eq} + (B_y + \Omega_y/\gamma_n)(B_z - B_{az})}{B_x^2 + (B_y + \Omega_y/\gamma_n)^2 + (B_z - B_{az})^2 + B_{eq}^2} P_{n0} \approx \frac{B_y + \Omega_y/\gamma_n}{B_z - B_{az}} P_{nz}. \quad (7)$$

Compensating field B_z (shown in fig. 2) is added so that the alkali works under the SERF regime. Setting $B_z - B_{az} - B_{nz} = 0$ (compensation point) and considering that $B_{nz} = kP_{nz}$, where k is the ratio between magnetization and polarization, we can obtain from equation (7) the compensation equation of SERF gyroscope,

$$B_y = kP_{ny} - \Omega_y/\gamma_n. \quad (8)$$

Similar to the signal before Lock-in amplifier in NMR gyroscope, the balanced polarimetry output of fig. 2 is

$$S_{SERF} = 2I_0\theta = I_0 n l c r_e f D(v) P_x. \quad (9)$$

where in a near zero-field SERF regime, P_x is as below^{19,20},

$$P_x \approx -P_0 T_{2a} \gamma_a B_{ay}. \quad (10)$$

where T_{2a} is the transverse relaxation time of alkali spin polarization, γ_a is the gyromagnetic ratio of alkali atoms, $B_{ay} = B_y - kP_{ny} + \Omega_y/\gamma_a$ is the effective field sensed by the alkali atoms.

Insert equation (10) into equation (9) and replace B_{ay} with $B_y - kP_{ny} + \Omega_y/\gamma_a$, we obtain,

$$S_{SERF} = I_0 n l c r_e f D(v) P_0 T_{2a} (-\gamma_a B_{ay}) = I_0 n l c r_e f D(v) P_0 T_{2a} [kP_{ny} \gamma_a - (B_y \gamma_a + \Omega_y)]. \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) has the same form with equation (5). As SERF magnetometer is essentially a zero resonance magnetometer, $-\gamma_a B_{ay}$ in equation (11) can be thought as the detune Δw from zero frequency.

Insert the compensation equation (8) into equation (11), we obtain,

$$S_{SERF} = I_0 n l c r_e f D(v) P_0 T_{2a} \left(\frac{\gamma_a}{\gamma_n} - 1 \right) \Omega_y = H \cdot T_{2a} \left(\frac{\gamma_a}{\gamma_n} - 1 \right) \Omega_y \quad (12)$$

Table I compares NMR gyroscope and SERF gyroscope. Both kinds of gyroscope has a compensation equation with the same form. B_y is the bridge between two kinds of species. For the compensation specie there must be an equation between B_y and the equivalent field of rotation, which becomes a compensation equation once the extra term can be stabilized (for NMR) or eliminated (for SERF). The output signals of both gyroscopes are also similar, the difference is that because the γ_a is usually three orders larger than γ_n , the enhancement factor of SERF gyroscope is usually bigger than that of NMR gyroscope. On the contrary, the longer transverse relaxation time of nuclear spin polarization can increase the NMR signal to offset this shortage. There is an extra terms in NMR gyroscope output signal, i.e. $\frac{1}{2} \frac{B_n}{B_y} \sqrt{\frac{T_{2n2}}{T_{1n2}}}$, from which we can see that the signal is proportional to the ratio of B_n and B_y . Although B_y in NMR gyroscope is eliminated from the bias drift after compensation, it affects the scale factor in an inversely proportional form.

We analyze the commonality between two actively-developed nuclear-spin gyroscope schemes. The results shown that both gyroscopes share similar compensation mechanism, which may be used in the further improvement of gyroscope, such as the elimination of the alkali magnetization. The quantitative and direct comparison of the output signal provides an important guidance for the scheme choosing and optimization of atomic gyroscope. And the analysis also gives a clear view how the main field B_y affect the scale factor even after compensation.

This work was supported by the Nature Science Foundation of China under Grant 61273067, 51675034 and 61074171.

¹T. Zhang, G. Qian, Y.-Y. Wang, X.-J. Xue, F. Shan, R.-Z. Li, J.-Y. Wu, and X.-Y. Zhang, "Integrated optical gyroscope using active long-range surface plasmon-polariton waveguide resonator," *Sci. Rep.* **4** (2014).

²C. W. F. Everitt, D. B. DeBra, B. Parkinson, J. Turneaure, J. Conklin, M. I. Heifetz, and G. M. Keiser, "Gravity probe b: Final results of a space experiment to test general relativity," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 221101 (2011).

³M. Bulatowicz, R. Griffith, and M. Larsen, "Laboratory search for a long-range t-odd, p-odd interaction from axionlike particles using dual-species nuclear magnetic resonance with polarized ¹²⁹Xe and ¹³¹Xe gas," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 102001 (2013).

⁴T. W. Kornack, *A test of CPT and Lorentz symmetry using K-³He co-magnetometer*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University (2005).

⁵M. Smiciklas, J. Brown, L. Cheuk, S. Smullin, and M. Romalis, "New test of local lorentz invariance using a ²¹Ne-Rb-K comagnetometer," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 171604 (2011).

⁶D. Budker and D. F. J. Kimball, *Optical Magnetometry* (Cambridge U. Press, 2013).

⁷E. A. Donley, "Nuclear magnetic resonance gyroscopes," *IEEE Sensors J.* **143**, 17-22 (2010).

	Compensation equation	Output Signal	Enhancement factor
NMR gyroscope	$B_y = B_1 - \Omega_y/\gamma_1$	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{B_n}{B_y} \sqrt{\frac{T_{2n2}}{T_{1n2}}} \cdot H \cdot T_{2n2} \left(\frac{\gamma_{n2}}{\gamma_{n1}} - 1 \right) \Omega_y$	$\frac{\gamma_{n2}}{\gamma_{n1}} - 1$
SERF gyroscope	$B_y = kP_{ny} - \Omega_y/\gamma_n$	$H \cdot T_{2a} \left(\frac{\gamma_a}{\gamma_n} - 1 \right) \Omega_y$	$\frac{\gamma_a}{\gamma_n} - 1$

TABLE I. Comparison between NMR and SERF gyroscopes

- ⁸J. H. Simpson, J. T. Fraser, and I. A. Greenwood, “An optically pumped nuclear magnetic resonance gyroscope,” *IEEE Trans. Aerosp.* **1**, 1107–1110 (1963).
- ⁹T. G. Walker and M. S. Larsen, “Spin-exchange pumped nmr gyros,” arXiv:1604.03982v1 (2016).
- ¹⁰T. G. Walker and W. Happer, “Spin-exchange optical pumping of noble-gas nuclei,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **69**, 629 (1997).
- ¹¹X. Liu, C. Chen, T. Qu, K. Yang, and H. Luo, “Transverse spin relaxation and diffusion-constant measurements of spin-polarized ¹²⁹Xe nuclei in the presence of a magnetic field gradient,” *Sci. Rep.* **6** (2016).
- ¹²D. Sheng, A. Kabcenell, and M. V. Romalis, “New classes of systematic effects in gas spin comagnetometers,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 163002 (2014).
- ¹³A. Korver, D. Thrasher, M. Bulatowicz, and T. G. Walker, “Synchronous spin-exchange optical pumping,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 253001 (2015).
- ¹⁴M. Limes, D. Sheng, and M. Romalis, “A 3He-129Xe comagnetometer with 87Rb magnetometry,” *Bulletin of the American Physical Society* (2016).
- ¹⁵T. W. Kornack, R. K. Ghosh, and M. V. Romalis, “Nuclear spin gyroscope based on an atomic comagnetometer,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 230801 (2005).
- ¹⁶J. Fang, J. Qin, and S. Wan, “Atomic spin gyroscope based on ¹²⁹Xe-cs comagnetometer,” *Chin. Sci. Bull.* **58**, 1512–1515 (2013).
- ¹⁷H. Dong, J. Fang, and J. Qin, “Analysis of the electrons-nuclei coupled atomic gyroscope,” *Opt. Commun.* **284**, 2886–2889 (2011).
- ¹⁸S. J. Seltzer, *Developments in alkali-metal atomic magnetometry*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University (2008).
- ¹⁹M. P. Ledbetter, I. M. Savukov, V. M. Acosta, and D. Budker, “Spin-exchange-relaxation-free magnetometry with cs vapor,” *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 033408 (2008).
- ²⁰S. J. Seltzer and M. V. Romalis, “Unshielded three-axis vector operation of a spin-exchange-relaxation-free atomic magnetometer,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **85**, 4804–4806 (2004).
- ²¹J. C. Allred, R. N. Lyman, T. W. Kornack, and M. V. Romalis, “High-sensitivity atomic magnetometer unaffected by spin-exchange relaxation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 130801 (2014).
- ²²E. A. Donley, “Nuclear magnetic resonance gyroscopes,” in *Proceedings to the IEEE Sensors Conference* (2010) pp. 17–22.
- ²³J. M. Brown, *A new limit on Lorentz- and CPT-violating neutron spin interactions using a K-³He Comagnetometer*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University (2011).